



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We can only say that Mr. Brown does not prove his main thesis, nor even justify his indefinite title; but it is to be hoped that either he or some other will achieve more marked success in studying this particular field.

In method of treatment the work is still more open to criticism. The direction of the text is slipshod and that of the bibliography execrable. Footnotes are inadequate and carelessly worded. Manuscript sources are almost completely ignored and even the best printed editions of the writings of contemporary statesmen are not mentioned. There is no reference to the monographs of Harding and Cushing, nor to Morrison's recently published *Life and letters of Harrison Gray Otis*, to mention only a few obvious titles in the field treated. Why the author consulted none of the rich periodical and manuscript collections in Washington, to say nothing of those in Philadelphia, New York and Worcester, is incomprehensible. In his search through extant sources he fails more completely than in his interpretation of those he used. Such careless and partial work seems inexcusable in what purports to be a definitive historical study.

I. J. C.

The financial administration of the colony of Virginia. By Percy Scott Flippin, Ph.D., professor of history and economics, Central university of Kentucky. [Johns Hopkins university studies in historical and political science, series xxxiii, no. 2.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins press, 1915. 95 p. \$.50)

This study is the forerunner and part of a promised monograph on royal government in Virginia. The history of the imperial connection of the old dominion is much to be desired and has long been awaited, and the hope is entertained that the promise will be fulfilled in good season. The present chapter deals with the system and kinds of taxation, provincial, royal and imperial, the objects and purposes of expenditure, and the methods and character of financial administration. There is brought out the close relations between the English merchant and the colonial planter, in many cases friendly, but frequently inharmonious as the result of a conflict of interests involved in credit transactions. There is revealed the looseness of financial administration which permitted evasions of the revenue laws and worked injury to the revenues. The study is objective and intensive in character; a classification and organization of a wealth of data garnered industriously and carefully from an abundance of sources, in print, transcript and manuscript. The reader is likely to be bewildered by the undue elaboration of detail and the reading is not made easy by good literary treatment.

A few errors of statement are noted for correction. It is not correct

to speak of the "auditor-general of the colonies" (pp. 38, 39 n. 1, 49, 68); there was an auditor-general of royal revenues in America. Surveyors-general of the customs service were not "first appointed about 1690" (p. 34). In 1685 Patrick Mein held the post of "surveyor of his Majesties plantations in America," although the office does not become of great importance until the appointment of the loyal Edward Randolph in 1691. The surveyor-generalship was divided into two districts in 1709 and not in 1690 as implied (p. 34). Comptrollers of the customs were not "instituted near the close of the colonial period" (p. 32). Philip Lightfoot was appointed comptroller and surveyor for Virginia in 1676 (*Calendar of the treasury books*, 1676-1679, p. 346), and comptrollers for other colonies were appointed in 1696. The penny-a-pound export duty levied on tobacco by the act of parliament of 1673 was not restricted solely to intercolonial trade as implied (p. 26), but under certain conditions was payable when the commodity was carried to England (*Calendar of state papers*, colonial series, 1675-1676, par. 814). The statement that royal customs collectors received from the English exchequer yearly salaries ranging from £40 to £100 (p. 26) should be qualified by the fact that out of this sum each was required to defray the expense of hiring boats and boatmen.

W. T. ROOT

Studies in southern history and politics. Inscribed to William Archibald Dunning, Ph. D., LL. D., Lieber professor of history and political philosophy, Columbia university, by his former pupils the authors. (New York: Columbia university press, 1914. 394 p. \$2.50 net)

This volume is one of especial interest in the historiographical field as evidence of the rise of a new "southern school of historians." For a large majority of the essays included are the products of historical students of southern birth and breeding. It is a matter of no slight importance that as toilers for the doctorate these representatives of the new south have migrated northward to the class room of a northern guide and philosopher to receive words of wisdom and inspiration. After a perusal of this volume there can be no doubt that they have kept their minds open to the teaching of a sane and scientific brand of history and with their master have rejected rampant sectional prejudice for a broad-minded tolerance, a temperate sympathy, and a critical understanding. The shortcomings that suggest themselves to the critic are those that inevitably occur in the preparation of a group of papers of this type on relatively short notice, since in many instances the opportunities of getting at fresh material on new topics are too limited. All in all, how-